

Printed: 04-21-97
By: Howe, Carol
Priority: Normal
Topic: Fwd: Spies/Louma message st
Sent: 04-21-97
From: rwoodard@goldeneye.water.ca.go
To: Howe, Carol; Carol Howe

-Need studies to
problem but also
actions to address
well known problems
- Adaptive Management
important

Mail*Link»

Fwd: Spies/Louma message stream (fwd)

>Date: Fri, 18 Apr 1997 17:17:06 -0700 (PDT)
>From: Chris Foe <chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov>
>Subject: Fwd: Spies/Louma message stream (fwd)
>To: PWT <aquasci@aol.com>, awconsult@aol.com, bfinlays@hq.dfg.ca.gov,
> bherbold@aol.com, bobf@delta.dfg.ca.gov, brucet@sfei.org,
> chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov, dehinton@ucdavis.edu,
dmfry@ucdavis.edu,
> gfredlee@aol.com, hbailey@evs.wa.com, jay@sfei.org, jtm@crl.com,
> karent@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov, kkuivila@usgs.gov, lhsmith@usgs.gov,
> lrbrown@usgs.gov, lwintern@water.ca.gov, mjsnyder@ucdavis.edu,
> mjunginc@aol.com, nsinghasemanon@cdpr.ca.gov, phyllisfox@aol.com,
> scottperl@aol.com, slanderson@lbl.gov, snluoma@usgs.gov,
> spies@amarine.com, valc@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov,
vicdv@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov,
> wabennett@ucdavis.edu, cdarling@water.ca.gov, rwoodard@water.ca.gov
>
>PWT, I am taking the liberty of forwarding this message from Pete Rhoads
>on. Chris Foe

----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Fri, 18 Apr 1997 10:08:18 -0400 (EDT)
>From: Phyllisfox@aol.com
>To: billbennett <wabennett@ucdavis.edu>,
> kkuivila@s10ldcasr.wr.usgs.gov, lhsmith
>Subject: Fwd: Spies/Louma message stream
>

>I forwarded Spies and Louma's comments to Pete Rhoads, an MWD biologist who
>is chairing a committee to evaluate ecosystem restoration alternatives.
His
>comments, which I thought would interest the group, are attached.

>Phyllis

>-----
>Forwarded message:

>From: 102167.3134@CompuServe.COM (Pete Rhoads)
>To: Phyllisfox@aol.com (INTERNET:Phyllisfox@aol.com)
>Date: 97-04-15 12:56:03 EDT
>

>Phyllis-

>Thanks particularly for the messages re a more rigorous approach to
>restoration.

>I also heartily endorse what Spies and Louma are saying in terms of the
>necessary scientific approach. I am concerned, however, that the need for
>prompt, 'best information' action not be undercut. I believe it is vitally

>important that broadly supported, quick actions that have the potential for
>some
>good and little potential for harm be undertaken as quickly as possible,
>but
>in
>a way that we can learn from our mistakes and successes as we go. This must
>be
>paralleled with a scientifically rigorous approach to problem
identification
>and
>prioritization, and R&D on cost-effective solutions. The one dilemma is
that
>this scientifically rigorous approach is slow (I can cite several examples
>from
>my personal experience. Hard experience has taught me that it is neither
>appropriate nor adequate to defer action on significant problems, even when
>they
>are poorly understood! The key is to start doing good things to fix
problems
>(i.e. Catagory III), while also figuring out how to do even better things
as
>soon as possible (scientific research and development program). There
needs
>to
>be a dynamic tension and a balance between these different activities. I
>particularly support Spies observations regarding 1. Independent experts
from
>elsewhere, 2. Administrative structure not tied to the existing agencies,
3.
>Building Adaptive Management into the mission statement, 4. The need for
>discipline in application to scientific research and 5. High public
>accountability and visibility.
>
>Perhaps an important question is whether the short term approach and the
>scientifically rigorous approach are being appropriately blended together
in
>the
>CALFED Water Quality Program. I see the 'quick attack' stuff, but how
about
>the
>rigorous stuff?
>
>I also believe that the 'initial fix' projects should also be independently
>reviewed, particularly from the viewpoint of whether they are well designed
>to
>learn from success or failure. It's very important to not just do, but to
>learn.
>
>Thanks again,
>Pete
>
>
>